DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 046 851 SO 000 650

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Simpson, Elizabeth Leonie |
| TITLE | Who Becomes a Democrat? A Study of Democratic Socialization. |
| INSTITUTION | American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. |
| PUB DATE | Feb 71 |
| NOTE | 46p.; Presented at the Annual Convention, American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, February 1971; Revision to be published in "The Antecedents of Democratic Values" |
| AVAILABLE FROM | Jossey-Bass, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Affective Behavior, Citizenship, *Democratic Values, Educational Environment, High School Students, *Personality Theories, Political Attitudes, *Political Socialization, Psychological Characteristics, *Psychological Needs, Social Studies, Socioeconomic Influences |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Values Education |

ABSTRACT

This is an exploration of the discrepancy between expressed and enacted democratic beliefs using a written self-report questionnaire incorporating personality scales and indices, direct ideological questions, and projective questions to be answered narratively. High school students (n=412) of varying race and social class were studied in three communities. Data analysis techniques included Pearson r correlation, univariate analysis of variance, and chi-square. Findings indicate that psychological deprivation is highly related ($p<.001$) to democratic socialization and cognitive closure ($p<.001$) and suggest that democratic value teaching will not produce a democratic personality unless preceded by an environment which gratifies the basic needs of the child. (Author)

ED046851

**Clearinghouse for Education and Social Science**
970 Aurora, Boulder, Colorado 80302
Telephone (303) 443-2211, Ext. 8434

TO: Mrs. Orabelle Nuthall

FROM: Sharon B. Ervin

DATE: February 19, 1971

This document is very definitely borderline reproducibility, but I thought I'd try it anyway.

SP 000 650

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
ELIZABETH LEONIE SIMPSON
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

# WHO BECOMES A DEMOCRAT?

# A STUDY OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIZATION *

Elizabeth Léonie Simpson
University of Southern California

## Introduction

Collected in curiosity and ordered in hope, the data in this report are the product of an ill-contained and annoying suspicion that the schools, suffering from an ideological itch left over from the 19th Century, may be doing their tasks out of order. For some years now, it has been clear that the American educational system is not the bastion of democracy it is labeled in the national ideology. Values and the cultural myths of equality and opportunity are memorized and the mundane problems of a representative system are analyzed. Elections and voting are even walked through. Everywhere, the power of the flag and the President's picture shelter the school symbolically, and the stigmata of democracy are ritualistically displayed. Yet the political and social structure of our schools is not democratic, and many graduates of these socializing institutions are emerging class-conscious and difference-conscious, with an abiding lack of faith in the capability of their fellows to govern either themselves or the country.

These young people are learning the words, but where is the evidence that they know what they mean, feel what they mean, value them, live them out? Where is awareness that belief in the majority is an affirmation of belief in the individual and his capacity to function, autonomously, as a

SP 000 659

* Much of this paper will appear as a chapter in Simpson, Elizabeth L. The Antecedents of Democratic Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

discrete unit among the multicellular constituency of that majority? Or that it is the shape of relationships between men--and between men and their own powers--which defines the true business of democracy? If instruction in democratic values is being given (and it is), why is it being assimilated in such a highly differential way? All of these questions raised a larger one: What prior experiences may be essential to the accommodation of democratic training?

When we began to read, a theoretical relationship between psychological deprivation and attitudes, beliefs, and values, grounded in a limited but highly suggestive number of empirical studies, began to emerge. The basic postulate for a simple theory of value, and two correlates, followed:

1. Existential belief systems--that is, values--are the product of bio-genetic needs acted upon by the social environment. Therefore,
2. Prediction of value orientations should be possible from the knowledge of need states. Therefore,
3. Diagnosis of needs and subsequent gratification should make responsiveness to direct socialization possible.

The wild problem was being tamed by definition: Is there an association between prior experience expressed as needs and democratic values which may be found empirically? If so, what is its shape? Is it possible that gratification of physiological, security, belongingness, and esteem needs (as hypothesized by Abraham Maslow: 1954) is essential and antecedent to democratic socialization?

Review of the Literature

Much past work has been devoted to the relationship between democratic political values, personality, and interpersonal behavior. Beginning in 1921, with Graham Wallas' book Human Nature in Politics, writers such as Davies (1963; 1965), Almond and Verba (1963), Lasswell (1930; 1951), and Inkeles (1954; 1961a, b) have linked psychological deprivation to the acceptance of certain political values. Of this group, Harold Lasswell has probably been the most devoted proponent of the theory that psychological attributes underlie political attitudes and behavior. Although some recent workers (Hess and Torney, 1967; Jennings and Niemi, 1968) have suggested that the school rather than the home is the most important direct instrument of political socialization, Davies, stressing the family's role, posits a strong relationship between the satisfaction of physical, social, self-esteem, and self-actualization needs and political behavior. Bennis and Slater (1960) have suggested that American equalitarianism has its most important manifestation in the family, not the Constitution, for it is there that authoritarian patterns of behavior are developed. Support for this position is found in a study by Berber and Flacks (1967) of the values of activists whose families were strongly oriented to humanistic values and reared their children democratically. Following Erich Fromm's delineation of the authoritarian character (1941), in their famous Berkeley study Adorno, Frankel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) described the authoritarian, potentially fascistic personality as typified by anxiety, a threat-orientation to the world, and a cold and unresponsive home environment as a child, and suggested that, although he may not be directly taught fascist values, the child learns them from the social environment which surrounds him.

In their study of the civic culture of the United States, Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and Mexico, Almond and Verba (1963) described the role of the citizen as participant, as well as subject, and stressed the importance of training and practice in political roles—training which produced the sense of competence, or efficacy, that one can influence government. The sense of powerlessness or anomia, feelings of helplessness in an unpredictable social order and a meaningless world, have been related to need gratification by Seeman (1959) and Srole (1956). As Almond and Verba have pointed out, the individual who believes himself trapped by the mysterious and all-powerful forces of a world neither of his making nor under his control is little likely to value, or to participate in, self-government.

In a study of the appeal of communism, Krugman (1952) found that middle-class party members who did not object to the party's authoritarianism were anxious people who were lacking in self-esteem. Aronoff (1968), Hunt (1941), Keys (1952), Miller and Hutt (1949), Spitz (1949), and Wilder (1952), too, have related physiological needs and security and love needs to the development of social values. This linkage between social and political values has been commented upon by many writers including Sherif (1936) and was further demonstrated empirically by a study of college students in which faith in human nature proved highly predictive of political views, attitudes toward freedom of speech, and the readiness to call the state's repressive power into action. Goldsen, Rosenberg, Williams, and Suchman (1940) found that when the people were not trusted, the function of government was perceived as one of control. In a related study of high school participation in extracurricular activities, Ziblatt (1965)

concluded that the building of a subjective sense of "social trust" was more important than direct participation *per se*.

Objective social conditions may affect psychological deprivation. Lipset (1959a, b; 1963), for example, has established a positive correlation between wealth, urbanization, and industrialization and the development of democratic social values and behavior. In other words, the poor—whose economic values are highly democratic—are social authoritarians. Campbell, Gurin, and Miller (1956); Lane (1963); McDill (1961); Martin and Westie (1959); Stouffer (1955); Srole (1956); Roberts and Rokeach (1956); and Rotter (1966, 1968) have all found low socioeconomic status associated with intolerance or the belief that what the individual does doesn't make any difference anyway. Centers (1948) found persons in the lower socioeconomic levels so preoccupied with satisfying their need for security that they were not motivated by needs for self-expression, esteem, leadership, or even for interesting or novel experiences. In fact, since Aristotle's time a stable middle class—freed from the anxieties and insecurity of lower-class living—has been considered a prerequisite for democracy by some writers.

As may be seen from this brief review, a substantial body of theoretical and empirical literature has been built up which suggests a connection between basic human needs and the attitudes, values, motivation, and behavior of human beings, whatever their position in society. Would it be possible to find correlations between these needs and democratic values in subjects of high school age and varying social class? But first, the task was to decide upon a comprehensive and defensible answer to a prior question: What is a democrat?

The Democratic Personality

Participant and trusting, the democrat is a person whose view of human nature is basically positive, who knows in the darkest recesses of his being that the forces of the universe are shaped by a generally rational and trustworthy humankind which refers its personal wants and goals to those of others. From studies and comment in such diverse fields as political science, philosophy, anthropology, sociology, and psychology these characteristics of the democratic individual have been identified conceptually. But our concepts must have empirical relevance. To isolate abstractly and theoretically is one matter; to define behaviorally is quite another. To translate this general statement into specific terms, it is necessary to crack its contents into five fundamental beliefs, each operationally defined as a score on one or more of a series of scales:

1. belief in human nature as fundamentally good and trustworthy, as measured by the Rosenberg Faith-in-Human-Nature Scale;
2. belief in the ability of the individual to control his environment, his life, and his future, as measured by Rotter's I-E (Internality-Externality) Scale;
3. belief in the individual as capable of choosing rationally for himself, rather than relying on the judgments of others, as measured by Hogan's Survey of Ethical Attitudes;
4. belief in the validity of the experiences and opinions of others — that is, acceptance and openness, as measured by Gough's Tolerance Scale and Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale; and
5. belief that the rights of other human beings are to be respected, as measured by Gough's Socialization Scale.

Together, these beliefs sum to a view of human nature and the appropriateness of action toward human beings which approaches the theoretical view given above.

Hypotheses

Our most important task, then, was to see whether the subjects who were studied do indeed hold these beliefs and whether the degree and strength of the beliefs were related in any consistent way to the level and type of psychological need of the individuals who possess, or lack, these democratic attributes. Our major hypotheses may be stated in these simple terms:

1. Psychological deprivation is significantly related to democratic socialization.
2. Psychological deprivation is significantly related to cognitive closure.

Elaborating, we have set forth a number of more minor predictions to be tested as well:

1. Direct expression of ideological values is not significantly related to type or degree of psychological deprivation.
2. Direct expression of ideological values is not significantly related to democratic socialization.
3. Race is significantly related both to psychological deprivation and to democratic socialization.
4. Socioeconomic status is significantly related to both psychological deprivation and democratic socialization.

In this research report, psychological or psychic health means the gratification of the basic needs hypothesized by Maslow—that is, the presence of no deficiency needs as they are operationalized here. At

this stage growth needs such as the drive toward self-actualization manifest themselves. Psychological or psychic deprivation refers to the presence of one or more ungratified basic needs of whatever type.

Cognitive closure refers to the degree to which the belief system of the individual is closed to new stimuli, new experiences, new information, and the acceptance of the validity of the experiences of others. It is defined operationally as scores on the Dogmatism Scale (Form E) developed by Rokeach.

Democratic socialization is used here as the transmittal of democratic social norms from the culture to the individual. It is defined operationally as scores on the Faith-in-Human-Nature Scale, the Survey of Ethical Attitudes, the Tolerance and Dogmatism Scales, the Socialization Scale, and the I(nternality)-E(xternality) Scale. As we have said above, we find the foundations of political democracy in the underlying dimensions of its social infrastructure and the psychic manifestations which are the work of these dimensions.

## Methodology

### The Measures

Ideally, a study of deprivation and belief which is based upon personality and environmental variables should use a variety of measuring techniques including oral interviews and projective tests, as well as written questionnaires. Practically, it was impossible to adopt this multi-method approach and still draw a non-random sample large enough for the results to be meaningful heuristically. For this reason, the measures were limited to the use of a written self-report multiple-answer questionnaire (the Needs

and Values Inventory) incorporating scales measuring democratic beliefs or values, an original index of psychological deprivation, another measure of psychic distress (the shortened Manifest Anxiety Scale), and a number of direct ideological questions with two projective questions to be answered narratively.[1]

The Sample

In a field investigation in three communities, 412 high school students in western and southern United States were studied. These subgroups, forming a three-increment sociological continuum of race and social class, comprise the sample. Tramontane High School, set in the warm lands east of the California coastal mountains, has an upper middle-class, white population; Debouchement, at the other pole of the continuum, is a working-class, black enclave in southern Georgia. Somewhere in between, characterized by a range of race and social class, lie the students of Bayamo, a California bay city.[2]

This sample is not random in any mathematical sense. As many educational research samples are, it was chosen through connection, acquaintance, and non-systematic chance. It is comprised of three subsamples which vary in size, location, social class, race, and some of the psychological dimensions being reported as well. Nevertheless, each of these segments has in

[1] A description of the measures may be found in Appendix A of Simpson, E. L., The Antecedents of Democratic Values: A Study of Psychological Deprivation and Belief, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California at Berkeley, 1970; as well as information about the development of the Index of Psychological Deprivation. Intercorrelations of the measures of democratic values and the measures of psychic needs may be found in Appendix D, Tables 1 and 2.

[2] The full description of the sample appears in Appendix B of Simpson (1970).

common with the others certain unifying characteristics, both social and psychic: the subjects are all American, all in mid-adolescence, all in American public schools, and attending social studies courses within those schools. The prediction was made (and supported by the data) that the full range of basic psychological needs would appear within each group and, on some level, be related to the presence of democratic values as operationalized here.

Procedure

In the spring and fall of 1969, the Needs and Values Inventory was administered in the field to social studies classes within three public high schools. On two days, over approximately an hour and a half, the subjects recorded their responses in separate booklets. The data were then coded and keypunched for 6400 scoring and statistical analyses at the University of California, Berkeley, Computer Center.

Data analysis was done using the Pearson r product-moment correlation to determine an association between democratic values and psychological deprivation. Significance was reported at the .05 level or below. Univariate analysis of variance (anova) was used to show differences between single- and two-factor SES and race group means and the f-ratio and level of significance reported. T-tests were used to measure the significance of dichotomous need/no-need group means and percentage tables reporting Chi-square were analyzed to determine whether a relationship exists within the sample (a) between certain demographic characteristics and needs and (b) between expressed value preferences based on American ideology and their enactment as operationalized in specific measures of democratic belief and between these preferences and levels of psychological deprivation.

## Findings

### Psychic Deficiency

Maslow theorizes that much of the time most human beings are motivated primarily by one need, although the level of motivation may vary briefly and situationally. This hypothesis is supported by data gathered using the Index of Psychological Deprivation (IPD). Scores on each sub-index were then re-coded into need/no-need categories according to the following criteria: Physiological needs were defined as scores > 3; Security needs as scores > 5; Belongingness needs as scores > 5; Esteem-from-Others needs as scores > 3; and Self-Esteem needs as scores > 3. Psychological Deprivation was defined as a score of one or more needs.

Table 1

Number of Subjects[a] Psychological Needs (N = 412)
(in percentage)

| | |
|---|---|
| No need | 27.90 |
| One | 31.90 |
| Two | 24.80 |
| Three | 10.90 |
| Four | 2.20 |
| Five | 0.20 |

[a]Table 3 in Appendix D (Simpson, 1970) gives the number of needs for each subsample as well as totals.

Almost 60% operate at the level of one of the lower deficiency needs or, beyond the stage of psychological deprivation, at the level

of health when motivation by self-actualization growth needs becomes possible. An additional 25% have no more than two basic needs.

But perhaps more important than the scarcity of gratification within the psychic economy is the nature of satisfactions when they appear. As may be seen here, the deprivations are distributed unevenly throughout the sample. High percentages (32.5%) of the needs which are essential for survival in a sample heavily biased toward upper social and economic rank[3] support Maslow's assertion that psychological deprivation due to lack of gratification for needs, although exacerbated by objectively harsh socioeconomic conditions, is by no means confined to individuals of lower SES.

Table 2

Type of Ss' Needs[a] (N = 412)

| Need | Percentage |
|---|---|
| Physiological | 8.0 |
| Security | 24.5 |
| Belongingness | 46.4 |
| Esteem from Others | 32.0 |
| Self-Esteem | 14.1 |

[a]Percentage of need types in each subsample are given in Table 4, Appendix D (Simpson, 1970).

In Maslow's theoretical description, individuals will tend to be motivated by the need for recognition or belonging only after lower,

[3]See Appendix B (Simpson, 1970) for demographic characteristics of the sample.

propotent needs for psychic satisfactions and security have been at least partially gratified. Hungry, a person does not seek love. Afraid, a person does not customarily find in affection and community the stuff with which to combat a terrifying and unpredictable world. In a life prolonged on the ragged edge of survival the need for esteem rarely emerges as a motivating force.

Almost half (46.4%) of our sample shows evidence of belongingness needs. Although physiological and security needs are defined internally—as psychic reality—in this study, nevertheless, the high level of socio-economic status of many of these subjects makes motivation on this higher level of need both expected and plausible. Most of these families can satisfy needs for consistent food and shelter and outer personal safety, whether they do or not (although inner safety and the conviction that love, food, and shelter have been satisfactorily supplied may be another matter). A fifteen-year-old boy with belongingness needs wrote this in answer to a question about how he would define a good life: "To have a fair amount of good friends. Live in a community where I feel comfortable. Feel good about people and not base my life on material objects, but enjoy the material possessions I do have."

According to Maslow's theory, if needs have been adequately gratified in the past—in our society usually through the affectionate intimacies of nuclear family life—they should not emerge with great force later. The fact that they do, within this sample, seems predictable from the large body of literature suggesting that the adolescent shift from home to community via the peer group carries with it a sense of alienation and estrangement from collective reinforcements.[4] The high percentage of

[4]See especially Erikson (1968) on the adolescent identity crisis.

belongingness needs may, in short, be an artifact of the age of the sample.[5] The tension generated in this marginal shift shows up clearly in the high positive correlation ($r = .396$; $p < .001$) between anxiety as measured by Bendig's shortened version of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and the Belongingness index scores.

In the theoretical framework employed here, physiological and security needs have been closely linked. Beyond their gratification, on the next level of functioning, a qualitative change takes place from needs whose, at least partial, gratification is required for individual or group survival to those needs which are social and personal in nature. Although organismically based, these belongingness and esteem needs derive much of their satisfaction and some of their origin from human interaction. Like the need for belongingness—inclusive membership in a group with whom one shares goals, beliefs, and customs—the need for esteem from others can only be satisfied by other people. The social self, or "looking-glass self," that Mead (1934) defined is linked closely to the attainment of self-respect and self-esteem—a sense of worthiness in the eyes of others.

Here are the pathetic words of a fifteen-year-old girl who is lacking in self-esteem: "There is no friend that I am really close to and that understands me and I am not the type of person I would like to be." Beyond the need to know that one is respected by others, and dependent upon it, lies the deeper region of respect for oneself and one's own capabilities. Acceptance and recognition from others appear to be necessary preliminaries to valuing one's own self and to actualizing individual potentialities in a psychically healthy way.[6]

---

[5] Using the f-test, belongingness mean scores did not differ significantly across the three subsamples.

[6] It was among the West Indian fishermen with self-esteem needs, and not among the canecutter with lower needs that Aroneff (1967) found traces of the need for self-actualization.

In operationalizing the typology of needs, each item of the IPD was judged for its construct validity and retained or discarded on that basis. Further confirmation that the surviving items are indeed tapping levels of psychic distress is seen in the following table.

Table 3

Anxiety and Psychological Deprivation (r)

| Need indices | Manifest anxiety |
|---|---|
| Physiological | .184*** |
| Security | .163** |
| Belongingness | .396*** |
| Esteem from Others | .201*** |
| Self-Esteem | .289*** |
| Combined psychological deprivation | .418*** |

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.

In every case, the mean anxiety scores of those who were characterized by a psychic need differed significantly (p < .01 for all needs, except security: p < .05) from those without these needs.[7]

Anxiety, wrote Kurt Goldstein (Pietrowski, 1959), is the result of an active encounter with opposing environmental forces, "a necessary though by no means sufficient condition of self-realization in health, and self-preservation in illness." In its beneficent form, it has an

[7]See Appendix D, Table 5 in Simpson (1970) for the complete data.

all-pervasive role as a dynamic factor driving toward certain goals. But when "the environment is dreaded as a whole because it is felt to be unreliable, mendacious, unappreciative, unfair, unjust, begrudging and merciless . . . a menace to . . . development and to . . . legitimate wishes and strivings" (Horney, 1939, p. 75), when the torturings and tensions of anxiety are not fantasy but well founded on the reality of the environment which produced this psychic state, it is no longer motivation toward vital striving and the joy that successful trial gives to the striver.

Where such massive and debilitating anxiety occurs, the individual becomes a psychological cripple, a defective organism which, as Goldstein reminds us, by following a universal law of behavior regains order and organization only "through an appropriate constriction of its milieu" (Piotrowski, 1959). Through rigidity, repetition, and perseveration, anxiety is reduced. It is not surprising, then, to find this paralyzing reaction to stress associated with cognitive closure, lack of acceptance, the belief that the world is ruled by fate rather than consciously or rationally controlled, and a distrusting disbelief in the rights of others.

Table 4

Anxiety and Democratic Values (r)

| Value scales[a] | Manifest anxiety |
|---|---|
| Faith-in-Human-Nature | -.188*** |
| I-E | .245*** |
| SEA | -.010 |
| Dogmatism | .264*** |
| Tolerance | -.445*** |
| Socialization | -.277*** |

[a] I-E = Internality-Externality Scale;
SEA = Survey of Ethical Attitudes.
*= ∠.05 ** = ∠.01 *** = ∠ .001

Socioeconomic Status, Needs, and Values

Sociological Variables and Psychological Need

Age, language spoken at home, head of the household, number of siblings, and residential mobility were not significantly related to level of need as measured by the IPD. As may be seen here (in a table collapsed for clarity), sex was associated with one level of need and only for the Tramontane sample:

Table 5

Sex and Esteem from Others[a]

| Sex | | No Esteem-from-Others Need | Esteem-from-Others Need |
|---|---|---|---|
| Male | n | 92 | 31 |
| | % | 39.7 | 13.3 |
| Female | n | 90 | 17 |
| | % | 38.8 | 7.3 |

[a] $df = 7$; $X^2 = 14.666$; $p < .02$.

As we pointed out earlier, regardless of other social characteristics, women in our society, at least until recently, appear to have been somewhat more uniformly socialized into a generalized role of sex-specific behavior than are males. These young people are already playing out well-differentiated sex roles and apparently this is being done with a minimum of distress and rejection. Where expectations of secondary rank meet reality, the need for status to be granted may be muted. If the individual expects himself to be rejected and believes he should be, he is not likely to feel deprived.

Socioeconomic Class[8] and Race

The economically insecure inhabit an objective world with precariously few guarantees for survival needs and on these grounds alone, without the suspicions and depreciating regard of their status-conscious fellows, we would expect to find greater psychic deprivation than among those receiving a larger share of distributed economic and social values.

Anxiety, as measured by the shortened version of the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, was found to be related to socioeconomic class at the .039 level. When race is controlled, differences in anxiety remain among blacks (low SES $\bar{X}$ = 9.23; high SES $\bar{X}$ = 6.12), although not among non-black subjects (low SES $\bar{X}$ = 8.83; high SES $\bar{X}$ = 8.16). For blacks, a crucial variable intervening between experience and anxiety appears to be position on the socioeconomic ladder of the American culture. Controlling SES, significant differences disappear between the racial groups.[9]

Using as a gross measure the mean scores of the total IPD, we find a steady decrease in psychological deprivation from low to high social class:

Table 6

SES and Psychological Deprivation

| SES | Psychological deprivation | | N |
|---|---|---|---|
| | $\bar{X}$ | s.d. | |
| Low | 19.22 | 3.22 | 81 |
| Middle | 17.81 | 4.35 | 16 |
| High | 16.20 | 3.86 | 281 |

[8] In this study, the term refers to occupational role. See Appendix B in Simpson (1970).

[9] See Appendix D, Tables 6, 11 in Simpson (1970).

For each of the subindices of psychological deprivation, the association between need level and social class is less clearly marked. Lower means (and therefore less need) are associated with higher socioeconomic status and the psychic support which may be the product of objectively easier environmental conditions. However, differences between groups are most significant ($p = <.015$) at the basic level of need, the physiological, and at the level of Esteem-from-Others needs. In this sample, lower SES is confounded with race, but when SES is controlled, black and nonblack groups still differ significantly on the survival needs (Physiological and Security).[10]

The need for acceptance by others and their regard which blacks manifest in this study is in sharp contrast to the needs which nonblacks, whose expectations of acceptance begin higher, exhibit. When SES is controlled, differences between nonblack and black groups remain ($p = .011$ at the low level), a finding which suggests strongly the reality of the varying psychological conditions which these two groups confront.

The need for Self-Esteem is the exception to the generalization that higher scores are associated with low socioeconomic class. In our sample, heavily biased toward blacks on the lower level, low status is associated with <u>higher</u> self-regard than is high status. In a discussion elsewhere (Simpson, 1970) of the genesis of high self-regard within the supportive confines of intimate groups, we attempted to account for the development of a sense of mastery and self-worth among the members of the protective

---

[10] Using the f-test, Physiological Needs: low SES $p = .008$; high SES $p = .051$; Security Needs: low SES $p = .065$; high SES $p = .414$.

black enclave we studied in the South. How clearly social dimensions other than SES categorization affect this psychic state is shown when SES is controlled and differences ($p = .040$) remain between black and nonblack groups at the lower level.

Sociological Variables and Democratic Values

Going up the ladder of socioeconomic status, faith in human nature increases ($p = .064$) and greater internality appears (ns). Belief in autonomy and a personal reference of authority are highly associated ($p = .005$) with SES, as is tolerance ($p = .013$). Low dogmatism and high socialization, while increasing in the expected direction, are not significant. When nonblack and black groups are compared within each SES level, significant differences appear between low status groups on faith-in-human-nature, locus of authority (with the black group strongly based in the contractual authority of manmade laws), dogmatism (nonblack $\bar{X} = 138.67$; blacks $\bar{X} = 179.49$; $p = .025$), and tolerance (nonblacks $\bar{X} = 18.50$; blacks $\bar{X} = 11.97$; $p = .006$).

Within middle SES, the groups differed significantly only on faith-in-human-nature ($p = .029$) and, in comparing blacks and nonblacks of high status, significant differences were approached only in closed-mindedness ($p = .064$) with blacks more dogmatic than nonblacks ($\bar{X} = 155.50$; $\bar{X} = 126.95$).

To Summarize: SES, Needs, and Values[11]

Is SES significantly related to psychological deprivation? When status is considered together with race, differences appear significant only with Physiological and Esteem-from-Others Needs at the lower level

[11] See Appendix D, Tables 9 and 10, in Simpson (1970).

of SES, although approaching significance with Security needs, and with Physiological needs at the higher level of SES.

Socioeconomic status was significantly related to democratic values (faith in people, manmade contracts, dogmatism, and tolerance at the lower level; faith in people at the middle level, and dogmatism—approaching significance at the higher level) when race and SES were considered together.

We have, within the scope of our three subsamples at three locations, a well-defined sociological continuum which corresponds almost isomorphically with a psychic one. At the one pole lie the predominantly white, upper middle class, college-bound students of traditional Tramontane; at the other lies the black, lower class ethnic enclave of Debouchement, surrounded by a wall of rejection which as much shapes as contains it. In between these extremes are the students at Bayamo, in a state of change, whose transitions have brought together races, social classes, educational levels, the conserving and the innovating. The extent to which the involved sociological context of each subsample's situation affects the psychic disposition of its members is implied clearly in the continua of belief and deprivation mean scores which move evenly from the socially accepted and secure to those who are rejected and afraid.[12]

The students at Tramontane, for example, are more democratic than those at either Bayamo or Debouchement. They have more faith in people, more tolerance and less closed-mindedness. They are more likely to respect the rights of others and to have a sense of efficacy—to believe that they can control their environment and that what they do makes a difference.

[12]See Appendix C, Table 13 (Simpson, 1970) for the full tables of scores.

The one exception to smooth parallel movement of social and psychic dimensions of value lies in the locus of authority as measured by the SEA. Whereas the Debouchement subjects believe most strongly that the authority for their actions comes from the agreements which men, as social animals, make, it is the Bayamo sample which centers the origins of decision within the autonomous, reasoning individual. It seems likely that this reverse may be explained by situational factors, for a high degree of autonomy[13] may be a cultural expectation in an environment of intensified political and social awareness. Activism has been found to be related to autonomous and principled judgments (Haan, Smith, and Block, 1969). It is surprising, in fact, that given the dynamic and varied social milieu of Bayamo—the direction of scores toward Natural Law and autonomous principles was not stronger; its weakness may indicate the balancing effect of other personality variables upon the cultural context.

In keeping with our prediction of a relationship between democratic values and psychological need, the young subjects at Tramontane also have less psychic deprivation than the members of the other subsamples: 34.91% have no needs, as opposed to 25.44% at Bayamo and 7.58% at Debouchement.[14] Mean need scores descend along the sociological continuum for every type of deprivation (except for Belongingness in which the three adolescent groups do not differ significantly, and Self-Esteem in which, for reasons which

---

[13] Or, at least, suspicion of, and non-conformance with, existing social contracts, whether norms or laws.

[14] The importance of the perceptual field of the individual is shown in the higher (than Bayamo) percentage of Tramontane subjects with Physiological Needs. Among this well-to-do sample, high scores represent a sense of relative deprivation. See, for example, the discrepancy between actual occupational ranking of heads of household and perceived ranking of income level within the community (Appendix A; Simpson, 1970).

we discussed above, the Debouchement group at the lower socioeconomic pole is less deprived). We see here, then, the first indication as to how our primary question may be answered: Are the basic needs which men share related to the values which they hold? Let us explore our findings further.

Psychic Deficiencies and Democratic Belief

If basic deprivation is related to the values and beliefs which the individual has internalized within his psychic economy, we would expect to find significant differences in democratic value scores between the deprived and those whose needs have been gratified. To test our expectations, we sorted our subjects into dichotomous need[15] and no-need groups, compared the means of the two groups, and tested the significance of their variance using the t-test. For every almost subtype of need, mean scores for each democratic value differed significantly between those whose deficiencies had been gratified and those who were still motivated by the lack of their satisfaction.[16]

Within the distribution of scores found during this research, less faith-in-human nature, externality, locus of authority in social contracts, closed-mindedness, intolerance, and less regard for the rights of others are all associated with higher scores of psychological deprivation as measured by the combined IPD, as indicated in the table below. Further,

---

[15] Need, or psychological deprivation, is defined as having at least one need, whatever its type.

[16] Non-significant differences (using a criterion of $p < .10$) were found on the I-E Scale and the SEA at the level of Physiological Needs, the SEA at the Belongingness level, and Dogmatism within Self-Esteem/no Self-Esteem Needs groups. See Appendix D, Table 14, in Simpson (1970) for the complete tables.

Table 7

Values and Combined Psychological Deprivation: t-test

| Value scales | Needs[a] | | | No needs[b] | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\bar{X}$ | s.d. | n | $\bar{X}$ | s.d. | n | p |
| Faith-in-Human Nature | 4.90 | 2.68 | 268 | 6.59 | 2.51 | 110 | .01 |
| I-E | 11.73 | 3.72 | 274 | 10.29 | 3.72 | 112 | .01 |
| SSA | 19.09 | 5.77 | 286 | 17.21 | 5.53 | 112 | .01 |
| Dogmatism | 156.73 | 24.2 | 264 | 136.80 | 20.49 | 109 | .01 |
| Tolerance | 17.40 | 5.58 | 284 | 22.01 | 4.48 | 113 | .01 |
| Socialization | 29.44 | 5.60 | 286 | 32.04 | 4.52 | 113 | .01 |

[a]The need group here includes all those with any of the basic needs in the typology--that is, all of the psychologically deprived.

[b]The no-need group includes those whthout any needs--that is, without any type of psychological deprivation as operationalized here.

when the continuum of scores for each democratic value is sorted into high and low dichotomous categories,[17] we have unambiguous confirmation that it is quantity, rather than quality or type of deprivation, which affects the individual's receptivity to democratic beliefs, as shown in the tables which follow below. In the case of every value, the percentage of subjects who hold it declines as the number of total needs which motivate the individual increases. The one exception to this iron-clad pattern occurs in

[17]Scores on the democratic values, like those of psychic deprivation, represent an incremental continuum which has been dichotomized somewhat arbitrarily. Like baldness and locating the loss of hair which separates the bald man from the one with hair, it is hardly possible to find the threshold of, say, tolerance which divides the accepting person neatly from the unaccepting.

Table 8

Psychological Deprivation versis Democratic Values[a]
(in percentage)

| No. of needs | Faith-in-Human Nature: Low | High | n |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 41.0 | 59.0 | 100 |
| 2 | 57.8 | 42.2 | 116 |
| 3 | 76.5 | 23.5 | 85 |
| 4 | 81.6 | 18.4 | 38 |
| 5 | 88.9 | 11.1 | 9 |
| Total | 60.9 | 39.1 | 348 |

($df = 4$; $X_2 = 35.56$; $p = < .001$)

| No. of needs | I-E Scale: Internality | Externality | n |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 58.8 | 41.2 | 102 |
| 2 | 56.9 | 43.1 | 116 |
| 3 | 44.7 | 55.3 | 85 |
| 4 | 39.0 | 61.0 | 41 |
| 5 | 11.1 | 88.9 | 9 |
| Total | 51.3 | 48.7 | 353 |

($df = 4$; $X_2 = 13.54$; $p = < .01$)

| No. of needs | SEA: Natural law | Positive law | n |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 68.3 | 31.7 | 101 |
| 2 | 65.9 | 34.1 | 123 |
| 3 | 47.7 | 52.3 | 88 |
| 4 | 59.5 | 40.5 | 42 |
| 5 | 33.3 | 66.7 | 9 |
| Total | 60.6 | 39.4 | 363 |

($df = 4$; $X_2 = 12.87$; $p = < .02$)

(Continued)

[a]Criteria for dichotomizing values scores were as follows (high category given):

Faith-in-Human Nature $\geq 7$ (belief in human nature as basically trustworthy)
I-E Scale $\geq 12$ (belief in faith, luck, uncontrollability)
SEA $\geq 21$ (belief in authority of social contracts, rather than of the individual)

Table 8 (Continued)

| No. of needs | Dogmatism | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | High | n |
| 1 | 75.3 | 24.7 | 97 |
| 2 | 63.7 | 36.3 | 113 |
| 3 | 44.3 | 55.7 | 79 |
| 4 | 19.5 | 80.5 | 41 |
| 5 | 0.0 | 100.0 | 9 |
| Total | 55.5 | 44.5 | 339 |

($df = 4$; $X_2 = 55.14$; $p = < .001$)

| No. of needs | Tolerance | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | High | n |
| 1 | 44.1 | 55.9 | 102 |
| 2 | 58.5 | 41.5 | 123 |
| 3 | 77.0 | 23.0 | 87 |
| 4 | 97.5 | 2.5 | 40 |
| 5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 9 |
| Total | 64.3 | 35.7 | 361 |

($df = 4$; $X_2 = 50.19$; $p < .001$)

| No. of needs | Socialization | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Low | High | n |
| 1 | 56.4 | 43.6 | 101 |
| 2 | 65.3 | 34.7 | 124 |
| 3 | 75.9 | 24.1 | 87 |
| 4 | 85.4 | 14.6 | 41 |
| 5 | 100.0 | 0.0 | 9 |
| Total | 68.5 | 31.5 | 362 |

($df = 4$; $X_2 = 19.12$; $p = < .001$)

Dogmatism $\geq$ 154 (closed-mindedness and cognitive constriction)
Tolerance $\geq$ 22 (belief in acceptance and open-mindedness)
Socialization $\geq$ 34 (belief in the rights of others)

the relationships found in the SEA. The percentage of belief-holders decreases evenly as the number of needs rise except at the level of three and four needs. An increased emphasis on Natural Law--autonomy and principled decision-making--may be tentatively explained[18] as a denial mechanism which asserts, against the evidence of his experience, the outer independence of the seriously deprived individual who, building his own neurotic safety, rejects the shelter of the protective group and manmade contracts collectively formed.

Faith in Human Nature[19]

Recurrent through the literature of democratic political philosophy is the theme of trust and confidence. He who does not believe that human beings are fundamentally trustworthy is not likely to believe that the majority can rule either their private or public lives by themselves. He is likely to think that guidance and control must come from some unquestionable authoritative source, institutionally based, and historically removed from the decision-making powers of living men, which will keep the weak and the bad in line. Repression of personal freedom and civil liberties may be justified by him on the grounds that people can't judge on their own and don't know what is good for them.

Disenchantment and social alienation are revealed in the negative correlation (-.301; $p < .001$) found between generalized psychological deprivation and low belief in man, between the inner state of lack and the sense that man somehow is responsible for not being all that he should be.

---

[18] See Chapter III, The Basic Needs: Existence in Simpson (1970).

[19] Correlations between types of psychological deprivation and specific democratic values may be found in Appendix D, Table 15 (Simpson, 1970).

Even more strongly (-.330; $p < .001$), a sense of acceptance and worthiness in the eyes of others is related to the growth of belief that people in general may be trusted—a reciprocal interaction which supports earlier research reported above: the individual who believes himself worthy of respect is likely to find others so. A strong correlation ($p < .001$) also appears at the level of Self-Esteem for Tramontane subjects, although it does not reach significance ($p < .05$) for the combined sample.

Unlike the sense of Esteem from Others, which derives from out-group acceptance, Belongingness is gratified by membership alone, a sense of completion and integration within a community of shared meanings, values, and norms. Perhaps the lack of a significant relationship between this type of deprivation and belief in man's goodness may be best understood by recalling that membership and the sense of belonging need not be positively based—upon affection and belief that the other members of the group are good or loving (although a certain measure of reliability may be demanded). Community is a shelter, a base, and a psychic home, but it may be one in which this quality is its sole positive attribute.

In every case, then, except Belongingness and Self-Esteem needs, a highly significant ($p < .001$) relationship exists between psychological deprivation and belief in human nature as fundamentally good and trustworthy.[20]

Significant ($p < .0001$) differences in this value occur between non-black and black groups. Considering race and SES together, at the highest level those differences disappear, indicating that the illusive cultural

---

[20] See Appendix D (Simpson, 1970) for complete tables of need-value correlations.

quality called race (as well as other variables) may have some effect on these value scores.

The Sense of Efficacy

Trust, turned inward, provides the sense of power in oneself—confidence in capability and the capacity of one's actions to shape the environment. What people do and the amount and quality of their participation in social life and political activity are functions of the expectancy that their actions will have effect—that a powerful source of control is internal. When the reinforcements which occur to the individual are perceived as a matter of chance or luck and not the result of his ability to control, he is little likely to try to adjust or regulate the evolution of change in the world around him.

With such self-abandonment, he becomes fatalistic and superstitious. In the social world he is liable to acceptance of the status quo and the neglect of conscious choice as a force in the achievement of goals. In the political sphere he assumes the inevitability of "outside" control by the "they" who have power which can't be bucked, either by individuals or their combination. The forces which shape what happens to him and to other members of his political systems are external to his own will.

It is not surprising, then, to find a strong positive correlation between the continuum of internality-externality (with its poles of efficacy and fatalism) and the continuum which describes the satisfaction of needs ($r = .265$; $p < .001$). For each of the subneeds, except Self-Esteem ($r = .113$; $p < .05$), the relationship is significant at the same level. The anxious and fearful, lacking in a sense of self-worthiness and community and, on the most basic level, freedom from fear for survival

itself, are not likely to believe that their own actions may help to mold a world which has proved so dangerous to them. Efficacy is not a value to the psychically deprived.[21]

Belief in Rational Man

As tested here, the relationship between the value of principled autonomy and psychic health is by no means unambiguous. When all the needs are considered together as a total score on the Index of Psychological Deprivation (IPD), we find a strong correlation in the expected direction ($r = .244$; $p < .001$). The less needful an individual is, the more likely he is to believe in Natural Law and to accept himself and his fellow man (as independently functioning units) as a proper source of authority for decision-making.

However, a highly significant negative relationship ($r = .169$; $p < .001$) occurs between the need for Self-Esteem and the continuum of scores indicating the range of belief from Natural to Positive Law. (This negative direction also occurs with Belongingness needs, although the relationship does not reach significance.) High self-regard is associated with belief in Positive Law--belief that the authority for judgments rests in the laws and norms which men have developed collectively. This reversal may be explained by considering the specialized derivation of both self-acceptance and a sense of belonging from social groups. Accepted memberships and highly gratifying interactions within intimate, primary associations might be expected to root the individual's sense of authority to the groups which satisfy his needs, rather than to his own autonomous powers.

---

[21] For this sample, feelings of efficacy are not related to SES or to race (alone or controlled for SES). See Easton and Dennis (1969) and Hess and Torney (1967) for studies which find a relationship between this variable and both SES and IQ.

Physiological ($p < .01$), Security ($p < .001$), and Esteem-from-Others needs ($p < .001$) are all positively related to belief in manmade contracts rather than the principled decisions of the individual. However, in support of our theoretical conjectures above, the latter need has the strongest relationship ($r = .404$) with the Natural Law-Positive Law continuum. Without acceptance by others and worthiness in their eyes, the individual cannot respect his own capacity for judgment or rely upon his own powers.

As a democratic value, we concede, it may be argued that either end of the spectrum measured by the SEA fits within the confines of political philosophy. Men unite with their fellows directly or through representatives to make the contracts which serve as laws and rules and, as long as opportunity to participate, however oblique, is open to the majority, we may call this process democratic. Yet the essence of participation is <u>individual</u> decision-making and action (although these qualities are tempered by group influences) and the belief that each man <u>can</u> decide by himself. Autonomy is grassroots equality. We believe, as we did when establishing our premises, that a belief in Natural Law is more consonant with democratic personality as a whole. This belief as measured here, however, is not clearly related to <u>each</u> of the types of need studied nor to anxiety ($r = .010$; n.s.).[22]

<u>Cognitive Closure - the Rejection of Experience</u>

Dogmatism, as the term is used by Rokeach (1960, p. 183), refers to a total configuration of ideas and beliefs which are organized into a

[22] At the lowest level of SES, significant ($p < .001$) differences remain between nonblack/black groups when SES is controlled.

relatively closed system. It means a style of cognitive functioning, not the specific content which is manipulated in the thinking process. It "is not so much what you believe that counts, but how you believe" (p. 6). According to Rokeach, the personality of the individual--and the ideology represented within his psychic structure--consist of an organization of beliefs or expectancies with a definable and measurable structure. His cognitive activities are the processes and changes which take place within this already formed system of beliefs.

When an individual operates within an extremely narrow field of experience and is unable to assimilate new stimuli and data within his belief system, when he is intolerant of ambiguity and tentativeness and seeks a fixed and authoritative answer to questions and problems, he may be unable to cope with the demands for adaptability, accommodation, and openness made by democratic political or social systems. Basic to democratic functioning is the ability to compromise, to adapt one's wishes and requirements to those of others equally valid.

In theory, inflexibility and closed-mindedness seem highly maladaptive traits under any social conditions, for, as Roger Brown (1965) points out, even the Nazis needed creative thinkers. We would expect to find these traits strongly related to mental health and degree and kind of psychic deprivation as measured by the IPD. Indeed, a very strong relationship appears ($r = .538$; $p < .001$) between the continuum of open- to closed-mindedness and that of basic need. The need for Esteem-from-Others is most highly correlated with Dogmatism ($r = .553$; $p < .001$), although the correlation holds at the same level of significance for the subneeds as well, with varying degrees of strength. Clearly, the individual without basic gratifications, without security or membership or status, who has

been rejected by the "generalized other" which forms an important reference group for the growth of self-worthiness, may be seen as retreating and closing off a depriving world.

In earlier studies, high self-esteem has been associated with high dogmatism—and with low.[23] For our combined sample, the association between closed-mindedness and high self-esteem does not hold, although the correlation is in that direction. Responses from subjects at Tramontane indicate a strong relationship ($r = .234$; $p < .001$) between the <u>need</u> for self-esteem—that is, the <u>lack</u> of a sense of self-worthiness—and closed-mindedness. We infer from this reversal that the psychic defense elicited by this need is being managed in varying ways or, more simply, that some variance occurred in the respondents' perception of the testing instrument.[24]

<u>Acceptance</u>[25]

In its most passive form, tolerance implies nothing more than endurance or, perhaps, freedom from prejudice or judgmental rejection of others. As a democratic value, it includes openness and positive acceptance of man in the aggregate without reference to specific biological or cultural traits.

Consistent with our Self-Esteem/Dogmatism findings, Tolerance here is not significantly related to Self-Esteem. <u>With every other subneed, correlation with belief in tolerance was significant at the .001 level.</u>

---

[23] See Chapter V; <u>The Basic Needs: Self</u> (Simpson, 1970).

[24] With SES controlled, racial differences disappear in Dogmatism means.

[25] Significant ($p < .013$) differences appear in mean SES scores and race scores ($p < .0003$). With SES controlled, differences remain significant ($p < .006$) only at the lowest level.

Anxiety ($r = -.445$; $p < .001$) and combined IPD scores ($r = -.501$; $p < .001$) were highly correlated with those indicating this value.

We may say, then, that the less deprived an individual is, the more likely he is to be accepting and non-judgmental toward others; the less his needs have been gratified, the greater likelihood that he will not be tolerant.

Belief in the Rights of Others

Democratic theory, with its components of mutuality and equality, implies the existence of individual rights, both social and political, in the protection afforded to minorities. One man, or a small group, may not stand against his fellows, but if those others have internalized a view of man which grants to him the privileges required by the self, his rights to survival, property, order—life, liberty, and even the pursuit of happiness—may stand without jeopardy.

Gough (1960, 1968) found a sociological continuum ranking roles to correspond to the continuum of mutual expectancies or norms operationalized in scores in Socialization as a personality variable. In the present research, Socialization differences between racial groups, with no SES controls, were significant at the .0003 level. However, with SES controlled, differences between Socialization scores for nonblack and black groups no longer reach significance; differences may not be attributable to race.

Both with total scores of deprivation—as measured by the IPD and the MAS—and the subscores on each of the types of need comprising the Index, significant negative correlations are found with Socialization. The man who believes in the rights of others is likely to be an individual whose basic needs have been gratified; the more he lacks psychic health, the less he is likely to grant to others the freedom of personal respect.

Expressed Values and Enacted Ones

The young students who were our subjects were asked to rank six cultural values which were drawn from traditional American ideology: justice under the law, tolerance for all, freedom to govern yourself without interference, equality for all, self-reliance, and equal freedom for everyone. In their reflection of the social characteristics of the school communities, the values chosen as most important personally are interesting in several ways.

Table 9

Expressed Values Most Important Personally
(in percentages)

| | Tramontane | Bayamo | Debouchement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Justice under the law | 11.6 | 6.36 | 6.1 |
| Tolerance for all | 12.1 | 3.64 | 00.0 |
| Freedom to govern yourself without interference | 12.1 | 13.64 | 12.1 |
| Equality for all | 35.8 | 60.91 | 54.5 |
| Self-reliance | 15.1 | 7.27 | 7.6 |
| Equal freedom for everyone | 9.9 | | 19.7 |

Among the upper-middle class, mostly nonblack subjects who attend Tramontane, conservative expectations and beliefs are expressed through comparatively high valuation of Justice, Self-reliance, and Tolerance. Socially sheltered, their values lag behind the changing political climate of Bayamo's mixed social classes, races, and social as well as political activism—an involvement which is expressed in a high degree of agreement that Equality is the most important value.

Members of a black, lower SES enclave in the South, the students at Debouchement demonstrate dramatically their personal rejection of Tolerance with its implication of co-existence and mutual acceptance—a rejection further substantiated by comparatively high Dogmatism and low Tolerance scores. Regardless of the private cathexis of specific ideological values and rejection of others, we found the Debouchement subjects less cynical than either of the other groups in their perception as to whether or not these values are enacted nationally. It should be noticed, however, that neither of the other groups reached the 50% level. For all of our subjects there is very little belief that these culturally taught values are enacted.

Table 10

Perception of Enacted Values
(Percentage of "Yes" Responses)

| | Tramontane | Bayano | Debouchement |
|---|---|---|---|
| Justice | 41.8 | 40.0 | 53.0 |
| Tolerance | 18.1 | 12.7 | 19.7 |
| Freedom | 22.8 | 13.6 | 24.2 |
| Equality | 9.9 | 17.3 | 22.7 |
| Self-reliance | 42.7 | 25.5 | 50.0 |
| Equal freedom | 13.8 | | 25.8 |

Our hypotheses, however, involved more than the expression of conventional ideology or the degree of perceived enactment. We were interested also in determining whether, for this age level and these political and social values, an old truth still held: between words and action, no

relationship <u>necessarily</u> exists.[26] Further, (although we thought it unlikely), we wished to know whether a predictive association might be found between the expressed values and total psychological deprivation or the particular stages of the need typology. To find the support we sought, expressed values were run against both the democratic value scores and the indices of psychological deprivation and the results analyzed in percentage tables, using Chi-square as an indicator of association.

The results followed the prediction: <u>in no case</u> was a relationship found between total psychic deprivation or needs of any type and expressed values, nor between these personal values and democratic beliefs as operationalized by these scales. Interestingly, our findings supported an earlier empirical study of registered voters in college communities, in which agreement on abstract principles of democracy (including the belief that it is the best form of government, that the majority should rule, and that the rights of the minority should be protected) was unrelated to agreement on these principles when expressed in situational terms. (The investigators [Prothro and Grigg, 1969] concluded that any political theory that implies consensus of <u>specific</u> principles is empirically invalid.)

## <u>A Summary of Findings</u>

Let us return now to a consideration of our major hypotheses and the meaning of the data which we have gathered:

1. <u>Psychological deprivation is significantly related to democratic socialization</u>.

---

[26] See Hartshorne and May (1930) for a classic study of character education which demonstrated this old saw empirically for ethical values.

Each of the democratic values we have studied have been found to be highly related ($p < .001$) to generalized psychic deprivation as measured by the IPD. With few exceptions,[27] each of the value measures which define democratic socialization are significantly ($p < .05$ or less) related to individual subindices of need types.

2. Psychological deprivation is significantly related to cognitive closure.

Scores on our measure of closed-mindedness, the Dogmatism Scale, were highly related to generalized psychic deprivation ($r = .538$; $p < .001$) and to all subneed types, except Self-Esteem.

And what is the effect of our findings upon the subhypotheses?

1. Direct expression of ideological values is not significantly related to type or degree of psychological deprivation.

This prediction was supported by the findings: in no case was a relationship found between expressed values and quantity or quality of needs.

2. Direct expression of ideological values is not significantly related to democratic socialization.

As operationalized here in value scales of personality variables, democratic socialization was found to be unrelated to expressed values.

3. Race is significantly related both to psychological deprivation and to democratic socialization.

---

[27] Belongingness and Self-Esteem needs for belief that man is trustworthy; Belongingness needs for belief in the capability of the individual to decide autonomously; and Self-Esteem for intolerance.

Considered alone, this variable is significantly related to deprivation on levels of Physiological, Security, Esteem-from-Others, and Self-Esteem needs, and not to Belongingness needs. For this sample, it is highly ($p < .0001$) related to democratic values. However, in both cases, differences between nonblack/black groups generally disappeared when SES is controlled.

4. Socioeconomic status is significantly related to psychological deprivation and democratic socialization.

For this sample, SES is significantly related to Physiological needs and approaches significance for Esteem-from-Others needs and anxiety. Intolerance, belief in manmade rules as the authority for decisions, and low faith in the goodness of man are associated with low SES.

## To Conclude

We have returned full circle to the question with which we began this work. What, we asked, are the factors which may predispose an individual to incorporate certain values into his value system? In the process of seeking an answer, we have empirically explored certain relationships between psychic variables and historical correlates of democratic belief. Although we have found those relationships to be highly suggestive, we have not, it is true, studied directly the etiology of democratic socialization, its wellsprings and sources, and confirmation of causality must wait upon further study.

We have, nonetheless, used a new instrument (the IPD) which has tentatively been shown to have some predictive power to describe potentially

enacted values—values which cultural and situational factors may bring into play. If subsequent research supports the findings here presented, there will be widespread and serious implications for social education. If continuing, formal, institutional socialization, however reinforced, will not alone induce democratic values, we must find another answer, an answer which may lie in an environment which is deliberately planned, as an integral part of a curriculum commitment, to gratify the basic human needs of the child.

If the antecedents of democratic values are indeed the satisfaction of these needs, and a major objective of the school is democratic political socialization, the school must be prepared to contribute far more than it has in the past to the gratification of these needs. Perhaps it might not be too much to say that it must feed the child when he is hungry, let him sleep if he is sleepless at home, offer him quiet if his world is riotous—in short, provide him at whatever cost with a secure center of gravity in a perilous world, offer him companionship which is not contingent on his abandoning his Self, and render automatically the respect and recognition of his individuality which form the basis of self-esteem.

Wilhelm Wundt has written of the "psychic inequivalence of social facts." Democratic values and behavior are dependent upon the development of a personality which makes important and salient these values when they <u>are</u> taught. For the child to be a democrat, he must be capable of becoming one—able to utilize what he learns. Clearly, no conflict exists between substantive or skill-learning aims and goals of personality growth or mental health in the child. Neither can be achieved without the other. Cognitive and affective processes, as we have seen, interact intimately with personality variables, and intellectual development and the epigenesis

of democratic values are functions of the nature of school, as well as other, life environments.

## Problems for Tomorrow

> Education as a purpose is bound to be summoned.
> (Buber: 1947, p. 90)

Three conditions, we may say in summary, must be met for the emergence of democratic attitudes and behavior: (1) the gratification of basic needs which represent antecedents, or preconditions; (2) the opportunity of an immediate environment in which to learn and to practice these values; and (3) a democratic social structure which not only permits but encourages their situational expression. We believe (and we have shown some evidence to support this belief) that the latter is a natural outcome of the former two.

Children are insecure because their environment has made them so; they bear an overriding longing for membership and affection because they have not been gathered in and loved, and lack self-esteem because they have not had the opportunity to discover what *they*, whatever their abilities, can master and that *they*, regardless of their idiosyncratic or group traits, are valued. Which of these needs cannot be alleviated if a democratic society, as it must, finds it necessary for its own preservation? In the year 2500—if there is such a year—there will still be those who doubt the theory of evolution. Will there also be those who believe that teaching words alone will affect behavior?

Given a commitment not merely to the transmission of culture but to the building and maintenance of a *democratic* society, the school, like

Luther, can do no other; it must take its stand for reform. The processes of political socialization may be, as Dawson and Prewitt (1969, p. 213) have written, essentially conserving forces, but continuing to isolate the emotional, intellectual, and valuing components of institutional education will cost us freedom. These are critical times and failure to adapt comes high in crises: its price is extinction—if not literally of man, then of man with a given set of values, those which have been most honored since man beheld his brother and found him both equal and good.

## References


Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: John Wiley, 1950.

Almond, G. and Verba, S. The civic culture. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Aronoff, J. Psychological needs and cultural systems. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1967.

Aronoff, J. Psychological needs as a determinant in the formation of social structure. Unpublished manuscript, 1968.

Bennis, W. G. and Slater, P. E. The temporary society. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

Buber, M. Between man and man. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1947.

Campbell, A., Gurin, G., & Miller, W. E. Sense of political efficacy and political participation. In H. Eulau, et al. (Eds.), Political behavior. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1956.

Centers, R. Motivational aspects of occupational stratification. Journal of Social Psychology, 1948, 28, 187-217.

Davies, J. Human Nature in Politics. New York: John Wiley, 1963.

Davies, J. The family's role in political socialization. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Philadelphia: The American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1965, 10-19.

Dawson, R. E. and Prewitt, K. Political socialization. Boston: Little, Brown, 1969.

Derber, C. and Flacks, R. An Exploration of the value system of radical student activists and their parents. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, California, August 28-31, 1967.

Easton, D. and Dennis, J. The child's acquisition of regime norms: political efficacy. In C. F. Cnudde and D. E. Neubauer (Eds.), Empirical democratic theory. Chicago: Markham, 1969.

Fromm, E. Escape from freedom. (4th Avon Library ed., 1966) New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1941.

Goldsen, R. K., Rosenberg, M., Williams, R. M., Jr., & Suchman, E. A. What college students think. New York: Van Nostrand, 1960.

Gough, H. Theory and measurement of socialization. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 23030.

Gough, H. An interpreter's syllabus for the California Psychological Inventory. In R. McReynolds (Ed.), Advances in Psychological Assessment. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1968.

Haan, N., Smith, B., & Block, J. The moral reasoning of young adults: political-social behavior, family background and personality correlates. Unpublished ms., Institute of Human Development, University of California, 1969.

Hartshore, H. and May, M. A summary of the work of the character education inquiry. Religious-Education, 1930, 25, 607-619.

Hess, R. D. and Torney, J. V. The development of political attitudes in children. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Horney, K. New ways in psychoanalysis. New York: Norton, 1939.

Hunt, J. M. The effects of infant feeding-frustration upon adult hoarding in the albino rat. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1941, 36, 338-360.

Inkeles, A. and Levinson, D. J. National character: the study of modal personality and sociocultural systems. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Inkeles, A. National character and modern political systems. In F. L. K. Hsu (Ed.), Psychological anthropology: Approaches to culture and personality. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1961.

Inkeles, A. and Bauer, R. The soviet citizen. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961.

Jennings, M. K. and Niemi, R. The transmissions of political values from parent to child. American Political Science Review, 1968, 62, 169-184.

Keys, A. Experimental induction of neuropsychoses by starvation. In Biology of mental health and disease. Milbank Memorial Fund. New York: Harper and Row, 1952.

Krugman, H. The appeal of communism to American middle class intellectuals and trade unionists. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1952, 16, 331-355.

Lane, R. Political ideology. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Lasswell, H. Psychopathology and politics. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1930.

Lasswell, H. The political writings of Harold D. Lasswell. New York: The Free Press, 1951.

Lipset, S. M. Democracy and working-class authoritarianism. American Sociology Review, 1959, 24, 481-501.

Lipset, S. M. Political man. (Anchor Book ed., 1963). Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1959.

Martin, J. G. and Westie, F. R. The tolerant personality. American Sociology Review, 1959, 24, 521-525.

Maslow, A. Motivation and personality. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.

McDill, E. L. Anomie, authoritarianism, prejudice, and socio-economic status: an attempt at clarification. Social Forces, 1961, 39, 239-245.

Mead, G. H. Mind, self, and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Miller, D. R. and Hutt, M. Value interiorization and personality development. Journal of Social Issues, 1949, 5, 2-30.

Piotrowski, Z. A. Basic human motives according to Kurt Goldstein. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1959, 15, 553-560.

Prothro, J. W. and Grigg, C. M. Fundamental principles of democracy: bases of agreement and disagreement. In E. Cnudde and D. Neubauer (Eds.), Empirical democratic theory. Chicago: Markham, 1969.

Roberts, A. H. and Rokeach, M. Anomie, authoritariansim, and prejudice: a replication. American Journal of Sociology, 1956, 61, 355-358.

Rokeach, M. The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rotter, J. Generalized expectancies for internal vs. external control of reinforcement. Psychological Monographs: General and Applied. 1966, 80 (1, Whole No. 609).

Rotter, J. Beliefs, social attitudes, and behavior: a social learning analysis. In R. Jessor and S. Feshbach, Cognition, personality, and clinical psychology. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Seeman, M. On the meaning of alienation. American Sociology Review, 1959, 24, 782-791.

Sherif, M. The psychology of social norms. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

Simpson, E. L. The antecedents of democratic values: a study of psychological deprivation and beliefs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1970.

Spitz, R. A. The role of ecological factors in emotional development in infancy. Child Development, 1949, 20, 145-155.

Srole, L. Social integration and certain corollaries: an exploratory study. American Sociology Review, 1956, 21, 709-716.

Stouffer, S. A. Communism, conformity, and civil liberties. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1955.

Wallas, G. Human nature in politics. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1921.

Wilder, R. M. Experimental induction of psychoneuroses through restriction of intake of thiamine. Biology of Mental Health and Disease. Milbank Memorial Fund. New York: Harper and Row, 1952.

Ziblatt, D. High school extracurricular activities and political socialization. In Political Socialization: Its Role In The Political Process. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1965.